

**PMR NOTE ON THE ACTION PLAN TO FOLLOW UP ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS
FROM THE PMR FIRST INDEPENDENT EVALUATION**

Draft – Version 2

PMR NOTE PA13-2015-3

October 14, 2015

I. Introduction

1. The first independent evaluation (“the Evaluation”) of the Partnership for Market Readiness (PMR) was undertaken by the University of Southern California’s Development Portfolio Management Group (“the Evaluator”). The Evaluation was guided and overseen by an Evaluation Working Group (EWG), composed of representatives of seven PA members. The Evaluation was part of a consultancy commissioned to the Evaluator with a twofold objective: (i) develop a detailed Evaluation Framework for periodic evaluations, whose output were presented in a separate report; and (ii) assess the relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency of the PMR, and suggest ways of enhancing PMR support to the Implementing Country Participants (ICPs), which were the subjects of the Evaluation report. It was recognized from the outset that it was too early to evaluate the PMR’s impacts and sustainability because implementation of its principal activities at the country level had recently begun. Thus, it was agreed that the evaluation assessment would be a “formative” rather than “summative” evaluation.
2. For the same reason, it was agreed that, of the two major functions of any evaluation—accountability and lesson learning—the assessment would focus primarily on drawing conclusions and extracting lessons from the PMR experience. The extent to which the PMR’s objectives have been achieved to date was also considered, as was the effectiveness of the PMR’s current management arrangements under the heading of governance. The underlying purpose of the evaluation, however, was to identify current strengths and weaknesses of the PMR and to recommend ways in which it could become more relevant, effective and efficient in the future.
3. The findings and recommendations from the Evaluation were presented and discussed at the Eleventh Meeting of the Partnership Assembly (PA) in London, in March 2015. Based on the feedback received from the PA, the Evaluator drafted the final evaluation report, which was circulated to all the PMR Participants in April 2015 and subsequently published on the PMR website.¹
4. The present Note sets out an action plan to follow up on the recommendations from the Evaluation (“the Follow-up Action Plan” or “the Plan”). The draft version of this Follow-up Action Plan was presented and discussed at the Twelfth Meeting of the PA (PA12) in Barcelona, in May 2015, and was subsequently revised in more detail, based on the feedback received at and after PA12. This final version of the Follow-up Action Plan is presented for final discussion and endorsement of the PA at its Thirteenth Meeting (PA13).
5. The Note is structured in four parts: The first part – Section II – highlights the main conclusions from the First Independent Evaluation Report; the second one – Section III – describes the main recommendations from the Evaluation Report; and the third and most important part – Section IV – proposes an Action Plan to follow up on the recommendations from the First Independent PMR Evaluation. The last section – Section V – specifies the action required by the PA in relation to this Note.

¹ <http://www.thepmr.org/content/pmr-first-independent-evaluation-final-report>.

II. Overall conclusions from the First Independent Evaluation Report

6. The PMR was established by the World Bank and officially launched in Barcelona in May 2011. Its formally agreed objectives are to:
 - a. provide grant financing to countries for building market readiness components;
 - b. pilot, test and sequence new concepts for market instruments, both for domestic and new international mechanisms, and to identify potential synergies between national market-based instruments (MBIs) at an early stage;
 - c. create a platform to enable policy makers of government agencies, practitioners, and public and private entities to share experiences and information regarding elements of market readiness, to learn from one another, promote South-South cooperation, and explore and innovate together on new instruments and approaches;
 - d. create and disseminate a body of knowledge on market instruments that could be tapped for country-specific requirements; and
 - e. share lessons learned, including with the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).
7. The Evaluation concludes that the PMR has generally been highly relevant since its inception. Other key conclusions are that the PMR has demonstrated substantial efficiency in terms of the mobilization and use of its administrative and human resources, and that its governance and management arrangements have generally worked well. Survey and interview responses with respect to these aspects were mostly positive. The Evaluator considers that the PMR's effectiveness to date in relation to its stated objectives has, however, been uneven. In their view, the PMR has been successful in establishing a technical platform to enable policy makers from ICPs, Contributing Participants (CPs) and other stakeholders to share experience and information on market readiness. The Evaluator also considers that the PMR has also succeeded in providing important technical inputs, particularly for the Market Readiness Proposal (MRP) preparation process. At the same time, the Evaluation report also concluded that it was premature to evaluate the PMR's achievements in terms of piloting, testing and sequencing of new concepts for market instruments, mainly due to the early stage of PMR implementation. Finally, the Evaluation team concluded that its performance with regard to the other three of its five official objectives fell "somewhere in between."

III. Main recommendations from the Evaluation Report

8. The PMR's responsiveness and flexibility in the face of changing circumstances was recognized in the Evaluation report. However, according to the Evaluator, this has also led to an evolution of the PMR's activities, as well as the language used in different communication materials to describe its "core" objectives. This suggests that it would be useful for the PA to revisit the initial objectives and consider ways of enhancing the PMR's present relevance, efficiency and effectiveness. The evaluation team

recommended a number of actions in this regard, of which the five main recommendations are summarized below.

a. Recommendation 1: Revisiting the PMR's Objectives

9. The Evaluator recommended reconsidering how the PMR's objectives were originally stated for three reasons. First, the focus and scope of the PMR has evolved over time in response to a changing external environment and the evolution of the needs and demands of the ICPs. According to the Evaluation report, the objectives should therefore be updated to reflect this evolution, including the terminology used (e.g., "carbon pricing" versus "market readiness" for example). The suggestion, therefore, is to redefine, rather than to change the initial objectives, and to make them clearer. Second, as observed by the Evaluator, the initial objectives in the May 2011 Design Document and Governance Framework are a mixture of inputs, outputs, and outcomes. In their view, the PMR's objectives should focus on its intended outcomes and longer-term desired impacts. Third, according to the Evaluator, greater clarity is needed with respect to each objective (e.g., knowledge creation and dissemination) in order to know what the PMR expects to be held accountable for and the associated assumptions and risks. This suggests that it would be useful for the PA to revisit its objectives (i.e., redefine and adjust, rather than change them substantially).

b. Recommendation 2: Reducing the Time Gap between PA Funding Allocation and Signature of the Corresponding Grant Agreements with the Delivery Partner

10. Some of the MRPs for which funding has been endorsed by the PA some time ago have not yet finalized their implementation arrangements and have not been fully operationalized. To reduce the time gap, the Evaluator recommends ensuring that the final MRPs are ready for implementation by the time they are presented to the PA for approval. PA and Delivery Partner appraisals should occur as closely in parallel as possible, rather than one occurring substantially later than the other. Required analysis by the Delivery Partner and capacity building by the ICP should occur in advance of this dual approval process. As stated by the Evaluator, this will require better coordination both between the country in question and the Delivery Partner, and between the PMR Secretariat and the Delivery Partner, than appears to have taken place in the past. In short, the Evaluation report says that the PMR should seek to better harmonize and align the timing of the technical and operational appraisals of the MRPs to ensure that they are implementation ready, both on the country side and with respect to compliance with all pertinent Delivery Partner procedures and requirements.

c. Recommendation 3: Enhancing the PMR's Knowledge Management and Dissemination Activities

11. According to the Evaluator, a strategic approach to enhance the PMR's Knowledge Management and Dissemination (KM&D) activities should start with both a clear definition of its purpose and scope and a clear understanding of its target audience. As key inputs, KM&D activities also need to be thought of in terms of their contributions to the PMR's objectives (i.e., desired impacts). What KM&D services the PMR should seek to provide for its actual and potential audiences, as well as how they can be

expanded to ensure greater outreach and potential influence, should be considered together with the most efficient and effective ways of doing so. The Evaluator recommended that the Secretariat elaborate, annually update, and present to the PA for its endorsement, a Strategic KM&D plan for the PMR. In their view, this plan would identify what services would be provided to each of the potential audiences, the resources required, methods used, and how such services can be expanded to ensure greater outreach and potential influence. In their view, this is a potentially significant way of enhancing the PMR's relevance and effectiveness in the future.

12. More generally, the Evaluator states that the systematization and greater professionalization of KM&D activities should play a more prominent role in a possible Second Phase of the PMR, and be closely linked with project and program level Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) activities.
13. The Evaluator also thinks that the PMR should more effectively share results and lessons learned from the PMR experience at both the individual country and PMR-wide levels with the international community, including the UNFCCC.
14. The Secretariat should likewise consider appointing an experienced knowledge management specialist to lead this work and help coordinate it with the broader PMR Technical Work Program. In addition, the Secretariat should explore more effective ways of managing and disseminating relevant knowledge that exists outside the PMR. Also, the PMR should continue using external specialists for preparation of demand-driven Technical Notes and other knowledge products. Finally, the Evaluator recommended that the PA may want to consider establishing a specific Working Group to help guide and oversee the PMR's knowledge management and dissemination activities.

d. Recommendation 4: Establishing and Operating a PMR Monitoring and Evaluation System

15. The Secretariat's proposal to establish a "PMR Results Framework" presented in Marrakesh in October 2013 and accepted by the PA, proposed the creation of a PMR M&E System with two subsystems, one for operations monitoring and the other for performance evaluation under the umbrella of the PMR "Results Framework." The Evaluation Report recommends the development of a full M&E system. It also recommends that the PMR Secretariat appoint a specialist to be responsible for the development and operation of the PMR's M&E system. According to the evaluation team, this would include helping to oversee M&E activities for the individual MRPs whose implementation has begun, and to aggregate and analyze appropriate information at the portfolio level, as well as coordinating other M&E activities in relation to other PMR inputs and outputs (workshops, training events, etc.) at both the individual country and the PMR-wide levels. The Evaluator also recommends that regular—at least annual—updates should be provided to the PA on the status of MRP implementation and emerging results and lessons to supplement reporting by the ICPs themselves. Such a mechanism could also be used to help inform senior management of the Delivery Partner or Partners informed of implementation issues that may need to be addressed and would also help improve the transparency of interactions between the PMR Secretariat and the PA.

e. Recommendation 5: Increasing the Transparency of Reporting to the PA

16. According to the Evaluation report, options for further improving transparency might include: (i) more detailed information regarding decisions involving resource allocation prior to PA meetings by the PMR Secretariat, or (ii) should the number of PA members increase substantially in the future, establishing the Partnership Committee (PC) foreseen in the PMR Governance Framework to undertake such preparatory work. In either case, the Evaluation team considers that the Secretariat should provide greater detail in some of its reporting to the PA (especially on administrative budget use and new financing proposals, in addition to continuing updates on Technical Work Program implementation, including the operation and deliberations of the various existing and proposed Technical Working Groups, and the outputs and outcomes of the upstream policy analysis work stream). It is also recommended that the Secretariat give greater attention to understanding the nature of these concerns in the future, perhaps through a specific survey of and/or one-on-one discussions with PA members. This would be important not only to increase transparency but also to continue to further strengthen the existing mutual respect and trust that has been achieved between the PA and the Secretariat over the life of the PMR. As noted by the Evaluator, the proposed KM&D strategy and operationalized M&E system would also provide elements that could help to improve the Secretariat's transparency in relation to both PA members and other current and future stakeholders. However, it should be noted that this would increase administrative costs for the Secretariat.

Additional Considerations Looking Ahead

17. In the Evaluator's view, several of the preceding recommendations, if implemented, have financial and human resource implications. This would especially be the case in the event that experienced specialists/consultants in KM&D and M&E, which are distinct skill sets, are added to the Secretariat team, which, according to the evaluation team, is already stretched in order to meet current needs and demands from ICPs and other stakeholders. The Evaluator also says that further resources would be needed to finance the proposed additional M&E activities. In the Evaluator's view, the incorporation of a seasoned Delivery Partner operational staff member could likewise help the Secretariat to better coordinate the technical and operational appraisals of MRPs. However, this could be achieved through staff rotation without significant additional cost. The Evaluator recommends the Secretariat to prepare a Strategic Staffing Plan for consideration by the PA and the World Bank. According to the Evaluator, even if additional financial costs are involved, the proposed enhanced staffing, KM&D, and M&E measures are likely to enhance the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and transparency of the PMR as it moves forward, especially if its scope and resources expand during a possible Second Phase.

IV. Proposed action plan to follow up on the recommendations from the First Independent PMR Evaluation

18. The two tables below constitute a revised draft of the proposed action plan to follow up on the recommendations from the First Independent PMR Evaluation. In each of them, each proposed follow-up action is numbered, for ease of reference, and grouped under one of the five main recommendations described in the previous section. Table 1 provides a description of each proposed follow-up action, with details about the proposed responsible party(ies). Table 2 provides additional information regarding each proposed follow-up action, including on the deliverables, the target delivery date, the order of priority,² and the human and budget resources required.

Table 1 – Description of the proposed follow-up actions

| No. | Proposed follow-up action(s) | Description | Responsible party |
|--|---|---|---|
| Recommendation 1: Revisiting the PMR's objectives | | | |
| 1.1 | Updating and revising the objectives of the PMR | <p>The PMR Secretariat proposes to work with the Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group (M&E WG) to carefully review and update the PMR's objectives, to ensure that its inputs, outputs, outcomes and impacts remain clearly defined and adequately aligned. Such revision would imply, potentially, an amendment to the Governance Framework, although the purpose of the exercise would be to "better define" the existing objectives of the PMR to reflect an evolution in response to a changing external environment, rather than to "change" them. In any case, any revision to the PMR's objectives would ultimately have to be discussed and submitted for endorsement by the PA.</p> <p>The goal of this follow-up action will be to amend the PMR's objectives to (a) better reflect the changing nature of the environment in which it operates, (2) link the activities and outputs of the PMR to its intended outcomes and desired impacts, and (3) establish what achievements the PMR expects to be held accountable for and in what time frame, as well as to clearly identify the underlying assumptions and associated risks involved. In revising the objectives of the PMR, the M&E WG will</p> | PMR M&E WG, with support from the PMR Secretariat |

² With 1 being high priority with immediate action, 2 being intermediate priority with action by the end of FY 2016, and 3 being low priority with action by the end of FY 2017.

| No. | Proposed follow-up action(s) | Description | Responsible party |
|-----|---|--|--------------------------|
| | | <p>make sure that the PMR objectives correspond to what the PMR hopes to achieve both in the short-run (i.e., its immediate intended outcomes) and over the medium and longer-term (its desired impacts). In defining short-run and longer-term objectives, the M&E WG will take different ICP contexts into account, recognizing that ICPs are at very different stages in the selection, design and implementation of their carbon pricing or other MBIs.</p> <p>In addition, because it directly refers to the “authorizing” or “enabling” environments that need to be in place at both the individual country and global levels for domestic and international carbon markets to be established and operate effectively, the M&E WG shall consider whether or not “positively informing and influencing the national and international policy environments for GHG mitigation” should be an explicit objective of the PMR.</p> <p>While the process to update and revise the objectives of the PMR should begin as soon as possible, the M&E WG and the PMR Secretariat will closely follow how the deliberations and negotiations leading up to COP21 evolve over the coming months and carefully consider their implications, if any, for the future objectives of the PMR as it contemplates a new phase of its existence.</p> | |
| 1.2 | Reconfirm what specific technical, institutional and financial capacities need to be strengthened in each of the ICPs | <p>In order to allow ICPs to achieve their contributions to the overall mission of the PMR, they will reconfirm what specific technical, institutional and financial capacities need to be strengthened in their respective countries. At the same time, the ICPs will review what enabling environment is needed in order for this capacity, once in place, to produce the intended outcomes and desired impacts, and to achieve the associated objectives at both the national and PMR-wide levels. This exercise will be conducted through the discussion on the Strategic Orientation for the Future of the PMR, including dedicated surveys to inform the latter, the PMR Project Implementation Status Reports submitted and presented by the ICPs on a yearly basis, and the “mapping” exercise conducted as part of the strategic planning for the PMR Technical Work Program.</p> | ICPs and PMR Secretariat |

| No. | Proposed follow-up action(s) | Description | Responsible party |
|--|---|--|---|
| 1.3 | Updating and revising the draft Evaluation Framework of the PMR | Based on the outcome of follow-up action 1.1, the PMR M&E WG, with support from the PMR Secretariat, will revise the draft Evaluation Framework that was prepared by the Evaluator as part of the assignment of the First Independent Evaluation of the PMR. This will include a revision of the draft Logical Framework as well as the related Evaluative Questions, both of which are elements of the Evaluation Framework. | PMR M&E WG, with support from the PMR Secretariat |
| Recommendation 2: Reduce the time between final MRP presentation to the PA and the signing of the respective Grant Agreements with the Delivery Partner | | | |
| 2.1 | Reinforce the PMR Secretariat team with additional support from staff with previous World Bank operational experience | To better coordinate and harmonize the PMR's technical appraisal and the Delivery Partner's operational appraisal, the PMR Secretariat will consider reinforcing its team by adding support from staff with previous World Bank operational experience. | PMR Secretariat |
| 2.2 | Seek to better harmonize and align the timing of the technical and operational appraisals of MRPs | <p>Going forward, to avoid a risk of delay, and also the possible need for changes in the affected MRPs due to intervening events in the domestic and external environments, the PMR Secretariat and the Delivery Partners will seek to better harmonize and align the timing of the technical and operational appraisals of MRPs by ensuring that they are implementation ready, including with respect to their compliance with all relevant Delivery Partner procedures and requirements. This is a measure that has already been applied, as will become apparent for more recent ICPs that have submitted their MRPs (e.g., Morocco and Vietnam). In some cases, to accelerate the process, some ICPs have requested that the PMR Implementation Grant be executed by the World Bank as Delivery Partner (e.g., Brazil and Costa Rica).</p> <p>In addition, whatever analysis by the Delivery Partner and up-front capacity building required by the ICP to enable implementation to start will take place as much as possible in advance. This will include better information on the Delivery Partner's</p> | PMR Secretariat, Delivery Partners and ICPs |

| No. | Proposed follow-up action(s) | Description | Responsible party |
|--|--|---|-------------------|
| | | <p>due diligence procedures and requirements, and, where applicable, the provision of training related to future project management and fiduciary responsibilities.</p> <p>In order for the PMR to become more efficient and effective, and to achieve its objectives in a timely fashion, the PMR Secretariat will seek to facilitate better coordination between the ICPs and the Delivery Partners and between the PMR Secretariat and the Delivery Partners. In particular and to the extent possible, the World Bank will seek that market readiness activities at the individual ICP level are fully embedded within the respective Delivery Partner country strategies and operational pipelines and portfolios.</p> | |
| 2.3 | <p>Implementation readiness requirements and operationalization of key implementation arrangements on the ICP's side will be taken into account before a final MRP is considered by the PA</p> | <p>To avoid a risk of unwanted delay, and also the possible need for changes in the affected MRPs due to intervening events in the domestic and external environments, implementation readiness requirements on the ICP's side should be clearly taken into account before a final MRP is considered by the PA. This includes the timing of elections and changes in government administrations, and the operationalization of key implementation arrangements.</p> | ICPs and PA |
| Recommendation 3: Enhancing the PMR's Knowledge Management and Dissemination Activities | | | |
| 3.1 | <p>Reinforce the PMR Secretariat team with additional knowledge management and dissemination expertise</p> | <p>As stated in the Strategic Plan for the Technical Work Program (see Note PA12-2015-2), the PMR Secretariat plans to have access to a knowledge management specialist in fiscal year 2016. This specialist will work with the Secretariat to develop and implement a more detailed and comprehensive knowledge management and dissemination plan.</p> | PMR Secretariat |
| 3.2 | <p>Enhance the PMR's knowledge dissemination activities</p> | <p>With a view to enhancing the PMR's knowledge management and dissemination activities, the PMR Secretariat proposed to implement the following actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Restructure, update, and improve the accessibility of knowledge available on the PMR website, to make sure it continues to be a primary vehicle for dissemination of knowledge; | PMR Secretariat |

| No. | Proposed follow-up action(s) | Description | Responsible party |
|-----|--|---|-------------------|
| | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Publish and disseminate knowledge products through the World Bank's Open Knowledge Repository (OKR), which has a wide and far reaching general audience and provides user statistics that can help the Secretariat better track dissemination; 3. Translate knowledge products that are identified as being useful in languages other than English; 4. Prepare and circulate a regular newsletter via email to a wide distribution list of PMR Participants, Observers and other interested stakeholders, which would include information on the PMR knowledge products and events ; 5. Send notifications of PMR activities and release of products through other distribution channels such as Climate-L, and continue to work with partners such as ICAP and IETA to make sure that their networks are also kept informed of PMR developments; 6. Continue to attend and speak at various climate change conferences to communicate the PMR's activities and build awareness. | |
| 3.3 | Restructure, update, and improve the accessibility of knowledge available on the PMR website, to make sure it continues to be a primary vehicle for dissemination of knowledge | Restructure, update, and improve the accessibility of knowledge available on the PMR website, to make sure it continues to be a primary vehicle for dissemination of knowledge; In order to maximize its potential as a knowledge management and dissemination tool, the PMR Secretariat will work on making the PMR website more user-friendly. | PMR Secretariat |
| 3.4 | Elaborate and present a knowledge management and dissemination plan | It is proposed that a holistic knowledge management and dissemination plan be prepared and implemented for the PMR. The plan would consider knowledge generated through the three streams of work – country level, technical work program and upstream policy work program – and detailed approaches and activities to support the management and dissemination of all PMR knowledge. The PMR will have access to a knowledge management expert in FY16 that will work with the Secretariat to develop a knowledge management plan that will be | PMR Secretariat |

| No. | Proposed follow-up action(s) | Description | Responsible party |
|-----|---|--|--|
| | | <p>presented to the PA for its endorsement. The strategic plan for knowledge management and dissemination would build on earlier work and relevant discussions, and determine the associated human and financial resource requirements to deliver this support.</p> | |
| 3.5 | <p>Clearly define the PMR objectives in terms of knowledge management and dissemination</p> | <p>To achieve the full potential of the PMR and to prepare for a possible Second Phase, the PMR will seek to enhance its knowledge management and dissemination activities. By clearly defining the PMR objectives in terms of such activities, the PMR will be able to consider how they can be used more strategically and effectively in the years ahead. In revising its objectives in terms of knowledge management and dissemination, the PMR will seek to clearly define the purpose and scope of the related activities, and what their target audiences are or should be. Furthermore, in order to contribute to the PMR's longer-, medium- and shorter-term objectives, the PMR will think about how its knowledge and dissemination activities could positively influence the national and international policy environments for GHG mitigation.</p> | <p>PMR M&E WG, with support from the PMR Secretariat</p> |
| 3.6 | <p>Link the knowledge management and dissemination activities with the PMR's M&E activities</p> | <p>The PMR M&E WG, with support for the PMR Secretariat, will seek to link the systematization and professionalization of the PMR's knowledge and dissemination activities with its country and program level M&E activities, as a way of more effectively sharing results and lessons learned from the PMR experience at both the individual country and PMR-wide levels with the international community, including the UNFCCC. This will be done by integrating indicators related to the PMR's knowledge and dissemination activities into the tools used by the PMR for M&E purposes, specifically the PMR Project Implementation Status Report and the PMR Evaluation's Logical Framework (to be finalized).</p> <p>To allow the PMR to play a more systematic role in terms of knowledge management and dissemination with its audiences, it will focus primarily on the dissemination of knowledge with respect to market mechanisms, with particular attention to that derived directly from the implementation of the MRPs and other PMR-supported activities, for which a strong M&E system will also be essential.</p> | <p>PMR M&E WG, with support from the PMR Secretariat</p> |

| No. | Proposed follow-up action(s) | Description | Responsible party |
|--|--|--|---|
| Recommendation 4: Establishing and Operating a PMR Monitoring and Evaluation System | | | |
| 4.1 | Reinforce the PMR Secretariat team with additional monitoring and evaluation expertise | The PMR Secretariat will consider having access to an M&E specialist in fiscal year 2016. This specialist would help overseeing the M&E activities for the individual MRPs once their implementation has started and aggregating appropriate information at the portfolio level, as well as coordinating M&E activities in relation to other PMR inputs and outputs at both the individual country and PMR-wide levels. | PMR Secretariat |
| 4.2 | Provide regular reports to the PA | Through the PMR Dashboard, the PMR Project Implementation Status Reports and the PMR Results Monitoring Report, the PMR Secretariat and the ICPs will inform the PA of the status of MRP implementation and emerging results on the ground, both in the individual ICPs and assistance-receiving Technical Partners and at the level of the PMR portfolio as a whole. Relevant reports will be shared with management of the Delivery Partner to keep them systematically informed about any implementation issues and emerging lessons that should be brought to their attention and for follow-up action. | PMR Secretariat and ICPs |
| 4.3 | Make the existing Evaluation Working Group permanent and expand its responsibilities | To help guide and oversee the design, establishment and operation of the full PMR Results Framework, the PMR would make the existing PMR Evaluation Working Group permanent and expand its responsibilities. The EWG would be renamed as the “PMR Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group” (PMR M&E WG). | PMR M&E WG and PMR Secretariat |
| 4.4 | Monitor and evaluate PMR activities on a continuous basis | Monitoring and evaluation of PMR activities should be a continuous process and not just the focus of one-off independent performance assessments every three to five years. In order to facilitate this, the PMR proposes to establish a more short-term logical framework, which would allow the PMR to monitor its performance more regularly. | PMR M&E WG, with support from the PMR Secretariat |
| 4.5 | Expand the PMR Results Framework by interconnecting the PMR Operations Monitoring | The performance of the PMR also depends on the proper delivery of inputs and realization of outcomes. Therefore, the evaluation of the PMR also relies on the information generated by the PMR Operations Monitoring System. In order to enhance the monitoring and evaluation functions of the PMR Results Framework, | PMR M&E WG, with support from the PMR Secretariat |

| No. | Proposed follow-up action(s) | Description | Responsible party |
|---|--|--|-------------------|
| | System and the Performance Evaluation System | <p>the PMR will revise it to link performance evaluation and operations monitoring. This will be done by expanding the PMR Results Framework to include an additional reporting tool – the PMR Results Monitoring Report – which will be based on the established results and indicators identified in the PMR Logical Framework. It will provide information on the overall (aggregated) status of implementation of the PMR and the progress made towards the Partnership’s expected results. As such, it will inform both the monitoring and evaluation functions at the Partnership level.</p> <p>In addition, the PMR Results Framework would also be revised to be able to monitor and evaluate the quality and effectiveness of other significant activities taking place at the program and country level (including PA meetings and side events, technical workshops and training sessions, PMR’s e-learning courses, website, technical notes and other knowledge products, technical working group activities, and the new upstream policy analysis work stream). The PMR would consider using standard exit surveys and other ex-post evaluation tools to monitor and assess the quality and effectiveness of such activities.</p> | |
| Recommendation 5: Increasing the Transparency of Reporting to the PA | | | |
| 5.1 | Increasing the transparency of reporting to the PA | <p>The PMR Secretariat will consider ways in which greater details could be provided in some of its reporting to the PA to help enhance the transparency of the interactions between the PMR Secretariat and the PA.</p> <p>In addition, the PMR Secretariat will be keen to better understand these concerns going forward, perhaps through a specific survey and/or additional one-on-one discussions with PA members.</p> | PMR Secretariat |

Table 2 – Additional information on priority and resources required for the proposed follow-up actions

| No. | Proposed follow-up action(s) | Deliverable(s) | Target delivery date | Priority ³ | Resources needed | Incremental budget | Remarks |
|--|--|--|--|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------|---|
| Recommendation 1: Revisiting the PMR's objectives | | | | | | | |
| 1.1 | Updating and revising the objectives of the PMR | Revised PMR objectives, for discussion and adoption by the PA | PA14 (discussion) and PA15 (adoption) | 2 | M&E Coordinator + M&E Specialist time | n/a | Included in budget proposed for recommendation 4.1 |
| 1.2 | Reconfirm what specific technical, institutional, and financial capacities need to be strengthened in each of the ICPs | - Plan for the allocation of remaining PMR funding for the ICPs - PMR Implementation Status Reports - PMR Technical Work Program | Ongoing | 2 | n/a | n/a | Part of "regular" PMR support activities. No incremental budget required. |
| 1.3 | Updating and revising the draft Evaluation Framework of the PMR | Final Evaluation Framework, for discussion and endorsement by the PA | PA15 (discussion) and PA16 (endorsement) | 3 | M&E Coordinator + M&E Specialist time | n/a | Included in budget proposed for recommendation 4.1 |

³ Priority ordered as follows: 1 - high priority with immediate action; 2 - intermediate priority with action by the end of FY 2016; and 3 - low priority with action by the end of FY 2017.

| No. | Proposed follow-up action(s) | Deliverable(s) | Target delivery date | Priority ³ | Resources needed | Incremental budget | Remarks |
|--|---|---|---|-----------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|--|
| Recommendation 2: Reduce the time between final MRP presentation to the PA and the signing of the respective Grant Agreements with the Delivery Partner | | | | | | | |
| 2.1 | Reinforce the PMR Secretariat team with additional support from staff with previous World Bank operational experience | Additional staff time to oversee the coordination and harmonization of the PMR's technical appraisal and the Delivery Partner's operational appraisal | FY 2016 | 1 | Senior Operations Officer time | \$60,000/year | Part time support from a Senior Operations Officer. |
| 2.2 | Seek to better harmonize and align the timing of the technical and operational appraisals of MRPs | Timing between final MRP presentation to the PA and the formal agreement on implementation arrangements with the Delivery Partner significantly reduced | FY 2016 | 1 | Senior Operations Officer time | n/a | Budget expense included in budget proposed for recommendation 2.1 |
| 2.3 | Implementation readiness requirements and operationalization of key implementation arrangements on the ICP's side will be taken into account before a final MRP is considered by the PA | More detailed information regarding the operationalization of implementation arrangements included in the MRPs | Immediately applicable for all remaining MRPs | 1 | n/a | n/a | Part of "regular" PMR support activities for the preparation of the MRP. No incremental budget required. |

| No. | Proposed follow-up action(s) | Deliverable(s) | Target delivery date | Priority ³ | Resources needed | Incremental budget | Remarks |
|--|---|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------|---|--------------------|--|
| Recommendation 3: Enhancing the PMR's Knowledge Management and Dissemination Activities | | | | | | | |
| 3.1 | Reinforce the PMR Secretariat team with additional knowledge management and dissemination expertise | Additional staff time to support the knowledge management and dissemination activities of the PMR | FY 2016 | 2 | KM Specialist + Communication Specialist time | \$50,000/year | Part time support from a KM Specialist and a Communication Specialist. |
| 3.2 | Enhance the PMR's knowledge dissemination activities | See column "Description" in Table 1. | FY 2016 | 2 | KM Specialist + Communication Specialist time | n/a | Included in budget proposed for recommendation 3.1 |
| 3.3 | Restructure, update, and improve the accessibility of knowledge available on the PMR website, to make sure it continues to be a primary vehicle for dissemination of knowledge. | Enhanced PMR website | FY 2016 | 2 | Communication Specialist time | n/a | Included in budget proposed for recommendation 3.1 |
| 3.4 | Elaborate and present a knowledge management and dissemination plan | Knowledge management and dissemination plan, for discussion and endorsement. | PA meeting in May/June 2016 | 2 | Technical Work Program Coordinator + KM Specialist time | n/a | Included in budget proposed for recommendation 3.1 |

| No. | Proposed follow-up action(s) | Deliverable(s) | Target delivery date | Priority ³ | Resources needed | Incremental budget | Remarks |
|--|--|--|--|-----------------------|--|--------------------|--|
| 3.5 | Clearly define the PMR objectives in terms of knowledge management and dissemination | Revised objectives in terms of knowledge management and dissemination activities, for discussion and endorsement by the PA | PA14 (discussion) and PA15 (adoption) | 2 | M&E Coordinator, M&E Specialist, Technical Work Program Coordinator and KM Specialist time | n/a | Included in budget proposed for recommendation 3.1 and 4.1 |
| 3.6 | Link the knowledge management and dissemination activities with the PMR's M&E activities | Integrating indicators related to the PMR's knowledge and dissemination activities into the tools used by the PMR for M&E purposes | PA15 (discussion) and PA16 (endorsement) | 3 | M&E Coordinator + M&E Specialist time | n/a | Included in budget proposed for recommendation 3.1 and 4.1 |
| Recommendation 4: Establishing and Operating a PMR Monitoring and Evaluation System | | | | | | | |
| 4.1 | Reinforce the PMR Secretariat team with additional monitoring and evaluation expertise | Additional staff time to support the M&E activities of the PMR | FY 2016 | 2 | M&E Specialist time | \$25,000/year | Part time support from an M&E Specialist. |
| 4.2 | Provide regular reports to the PA | Regular reporting to the PA, as outlined in the PMR Operations Monitoring System | Ongoing | 1 | M&E Coordinator + M&E Specialist time | n/a | Included in budget proposed for recommendation 4.1 |
| 4.3 | Make the existing Evaluation Working Group permanent and | Official establishment of a permanent PMR M&E WG, including terms or reference | PA14 | 1 | M&E Coordinator + M&E Specialist time | n/a | Included in budget proposed for recommendation 4.1 |

| No. | Proposed follow-up action(s) | Deliverable(s) | Target delivery date | Priority ³ | Resources needed | Incremental budget | Remarks |
|---|---|--|--|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------|--|
| | expand its responsibilities | | | | | | |
| 4.4 | Monitor and evaluate PMR activities on a continuous basis | Short-term logical framework, for discussion and endorsement by the PA | PA15 (draft) and PA16 (final version) | 3 | M&E Coordinator + M&E Specialist time | n/a | Included in budget proposed for recommendation 4.1 |
| 4.5 | Expand the PMR Results Framework, by interconnecting the PMR Operations Monitoring System and the Performance Evaluation System | PMR Results Monitoring Report template, for endorsement as part of the PMR Results Framework | PA14 (endorsement of the template) and PA15 (first presentation) | 3 | M&E Coordinator + M&E Specialist time | n/a | Included in budget proposed for recommendation 4.1 |
| Recommendation 5: Increasing the Transparency of Reporting to the PA | | | | | | | |
| 5.1 | Increasing the transparency of reporting to the PA | Enhanced reporting to the PA | Ongoing | 1 | M&E Coordinator + M&E Specialist time | n/a | Included in budget proposed for recommendation 4.1 |

19. The proposed follow-up actions on the PMR First Evaluation would require the addition of part time M&E, KM and Communication Specialists, with a total estimated incremental cost of \$135,000 per year, on average, for the current (2016) and the next (2017) fiscal year. This budget may vary, depending on the specific needs and the terms of reference for each type of expertise.

V. Action by the PA

20. The PA is invited to provide feedback on the final draft version of the Action Plan to follow up on the recommendations from the First Independent PMR Evaluation, and to recommend any additional steps that the PMR Secretariat can take to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the PMR, either before or during the next PA meeting (PA13).

21. Based on the feedback and recommendations received from the PA, the PMR Secretariat will make final revisions to the Follow-up Action Plan after PA13, and seek guidance from the PMR M&E WG on the final draft version of the document. Subsequently, the PMR Secretariat will submit it electronically for final endorsement by the PA.